



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/781,917	02/08/2001	Clay H. Fisher	50N3695.01/1582	9084

24272 7590 03/26/2007  
 Gregory J. Koerner  
 Redwood Patent Law  
 1291 East Hillsdale Boulevard  
 Suite 205  
 Foster City, CA 94404

EXAMINER

VIEAUX, GARY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/781,917

**Applicant(s)**

FISHER ET AL.

**Examiner**

Gary C. Vieaux

**Art Unit**

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set  
5 forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this  
application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set  
forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action  
has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on  
February 6, 2007, has been entered.

10

### ***Amendment***

In response to the most recent Office Action, dated November 3, 2006, claims 1,  
14-15, 17, 21, 34-35, 37, 41, 43, 44, and 46 have been amended.

15

### **Response to Amendment**

Regarding amended claims 14, 15, 17, 34, 35, and 37, the Examiner finds the  
amendments to directly address the previously identified antecedent issues, and  
therefore the objections to claims 14, 15, 17, 34, 35, and 37 are withdrawn.

Regarding amended claim 44, the Examiner finds the amendments to directly  
20 address the previously identified structural and antecedent issues, and therefore, the  
objections to claim 44 are hereby withdrawn.

Regarding claims 1, 21, and 41, the Examiner finds removal of the limitation  
"primary" now allows independent claims 1, 21, and 41 to meet and/or fulfill the written

Art Unit: 2622

description requirement. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection to claims 1-40, 41, and 43-46 is hereby withdrawn.

Regarding amended claim 43, the Examiner finds removal of the limitation "duplicate" now allows the claim to meet and/or fulfill the written description

5 requirement. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection to claim 43 is hereby withdrawn.

Regarding amended claim 44, the Examiner finds removal of the limitations "date" and "template" now allows the claim to meet and/or fulfill the written description requirement. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection to claim 44 is hereby withdrawn.

Regarding amended claim 46, the Examiner finds removal of the limitation "at  
10 least" now allows the claim to meet and/or fulfill the written description requirement.

Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection to claim 46 is hereby withdrawn.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1-44 and 46 have been fully considered  
15 but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 21, Applicants submit that the Sarbadhikari reference does not disclose any "on-line" procedures (Remarks, p. 21.) Additionally, Applicants also submit that the Sarbadhikari reference does not disclose any type of "active bi-directional electronic communication path" (Remarks, p. 21.) The Examiner respectfully  
20 disagrees.

Sarbadhikari provides a teaching of a data source being employed for not only downstream processing of images, but also being employed to transfer files (data, code,

etc.) to an imaging device (col. 4 lines 37-56 - lines 40-49 inclusive.) Sarbadhikari further provides that these files may be selected by the user by means of appropriate intervention through the camera, and that the data source is capable of two-way communication with the imaging device, communication that occurs while the data source is connected to the imaging device. This selection of files by the user, during two-way communication between the data source connected to the imaging device is clearly found to be on-line management while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists.

Applicants further submit that the Sarbadhikari reference does not disclose performing one or more on-line management procedures "while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists" (Remarks, p. 21.) The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Column 4 lines 37-56 (lines 40-49 inclusive) of Sarbadhikari provides a teaching of a data source being employed for not only downstream processing of images, but also being employed to transfer files (data, code, etc.) to an imaging device.

Sarbadhikari further provides that these files may be selected by the user by means of appropriate intervention through the camera, and that the data source is capable of two-way communication with the imaging device, communication that occurs while the data source is connected to the imaging device. This selection of files by the user, during two-way communication between the data source connected to the imaging device is clearly found to be on-line management while an active bi-directional electronic communication path exists.

Applicants also submit that the Sarbadhikari reference does not disclose one or more on-line management procedures "during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on said data source" (Remarks, p. 21-22.) Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Sarbadhikari, at column 7 lines 15-50, teaches the imaging device being used to view operational information related to the imaging device, including ancillary data files.

Sarbadhikari further provides that the data files, when available via the data source, can be identified on a display and that user intervention for selection of data files is conducted by the use of inputs in conjunction with the imaging device display, which is found to be a demonstration of one or more on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view, manipulate, and select said ancillary data files.

Applicants submit that the Steinberg reference fails to provide any enabling discussion with regard to receiving data from a remote destination (Remarks, p. 22.)

Applicants are reminded that issues regarding enablement, or lack thereof, are associated with and relevant to the Applicants' claimed invention only, and are not otherwise pertinent to the references used in rejection of the instant application.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Steinberg reference teaches away from their claimed invention, as the data flow described in Steinberg is in the opposite

direction to the data flow recited by the Applicants (Remarks, p. 23.) Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Sarbahikari reference, at column 11 lines 26-37, teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, which is connected to the imaging device. However, although Sarbadhikari teaches the data source being implemented as a computer, Sarbadhikari is not found to teach the computer being a computer in a distributed computer network (emphasis added.) Therefore, the Steinberg reference is employed to demonstrate the teaching of a computer being employed as a computer in a distributed computer network. Steinberg, at column 4 at lines 2-4 and 49-53, and by way of figure 1 indicators 16 and 18, clearly teaches an imaging device connected to a computer and the computer being a computer in a network, bi-directionally communicating data. Motivation to combine the teaching of these references was also provided (Office Action dated July 15, 2005), which stated "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

Based on the foregoing responses, the Examiner respectfully maintains the U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 1 and 21.

Regarding claims 2-20 and 22-40, each depend either directly from or indirectly from independent claims 1 or 21, and thus inherit all the limitations of independent claims 1 or 21, respectively. Consequently, based on their dependence and the foregoing response to arguments relating to claims 1 and 21, the Examiner respectfully  
5 maintains the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections to claims 2-20 and 22-40, as they relate to claims 1 or 21, respectively.

Further regarding claims 12 and 32, Applicant also submits that cited references fail to teach that the ancillary data files are created by both a system user on a local computer device and a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production  
10 equipment", as claimed by Applicants (Remarks, p.27.) The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 12 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data  
15 production equipment ('264 - col. 6 lines 58-63.) However, although neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to teach a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are also created by a system user on a local computer device, Aihara is found to teach that a user can create the ancillary data file (col. 7 lines 33-38.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to  
20 allow for a user to create the ancillary data file, in conjunction with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg in which ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer, so that a user may not only have the ability to employ the ancillary data



Art Unit: 2622

files provided by a manufacturer, but also to create their own ancillary data files in order to give the result its distinctive appearance ('190 - col. 7 lines 36-38.) It is further noted that the specification at lines 1-8 of page 15, provides for the creation of ancillary data files by the system user in one embodiment, and alternatively, by a manufacturer in

5 another.

Further regarding claims 18 and 38, Applicants submit that Anderson fails to teach a "data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network" (Remarks, p. 28.) However, as Anderson was presented to provide a teaching of a file descriptor identification procedure and menu reorganization (please see Office  
10 Action dated July 15, 2005), and as the limitations of a "data source being implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network" as claimed by Applicants were previously addressed in relation to their teachings as provided in the Sarbadhikari and Steinberg references as they relate to claims 1 and 21, respectively, the Examiner respectfully maintains the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection to claims 18 and 38, as they  
15 relate to the limitations as previously discussed.

Regarding claim 41, as Applicants have incorporated their prior remarks by reference with regard to independent claim 41 (Remarks, p. 29), the forgoing responses to the rejections of claim 21 are provided as response in kind.

Regarding claim 42, Applicants submit that the Steinberg reference fails to  
20 identically teach every element of the claims, and therefore does not anticipate the present invention (Remarks, p. 15.) The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The language of claim 42 is as follows: "A system for manipulating image data, comprising:

means for storing one or more ancillary data files;

means for capturing said image data;

5 means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing; and

means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files."

First, the Specification provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files  
10 which includes a service on a distributed computer network like the Internet, a discrete electronic device such as a personal computer, or a removable, non-volatile memory device such as a flash memory (p. 6 lines 16-20.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for storing one or more ancillary data files which also includes a personal computer (fig. 1 indicator 14; col. 3 lines 57-60), as well as a  
15 removable, non-volatile memory device (fig. 1 indicator 22; col. 4 lines 1-3.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Second, the Specification provides means for capturing said image data that includes an electronic camera device (fig. 1 indicator 110; p. 6 lines 25-26.) Equally, the  
20 Steinberg reference provides means for capturing said image data that also includes a camera (fig. 1 indicator 10.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Third, the Specification provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which includes wireless communications (fig. 6 indicator 632), removable storage media (fig. 6 indicator 636), and "any required type of interfaces or connectors (not shown) for coupling camera device 110 and other electronic devices or entities to thereby support bi-directional communications" (p. 12 lines 1-27.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing which also includes wireless communications, removable storage media, and cable (fig. 1 indicators 20, 22, and 38; col. 3 lines 45-60.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Fourth and finally, the Specification provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files that includes a central processing unit (fig. 3 indicator 344) employed in combining of image data with ancillary data (p. 9 lines 12-29.) Correspondingly, the Steinberg reference provides means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files which also includes a processor to execute camera functionality (fig. 4 indicator 122; col. 7 lines 14-19.) Therefore, the claimed limitation is found by the Examiner to be anticipated by the prior art element.

Based on the foregoing comparisons, it is demonstrated that each of the claimed limitations are also found within the Steinberg reference, and therefore the rejection to claim 42 is forthwith maintained by the Examiner.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 45 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC § 112 rejection of claim 45 has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections***

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**Claim 42** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steinberg et al. (US 6,006,039.)

Regarding claim 42, Steinberg teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising: means for storing one or more ancillary data files (fig. 1 indicator 14); means for capturing said image data (fig. 1 indicator 10); means for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said means for storing to said means for capturing (fig. 1 indicators 20,22, and 38); and means for manipulating said image data with said one or more ancillary data files (fig. 4 indicator 122.)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2622

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5        **Claims 1, 4-11, 13-17, 21, 24-31, and 33-37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325.)

Regarding claim 1, Sarbadhikari teaches a system for manipulating image data, comprising a data source configured to store one or more ancillary data files (fig. 11 indicator 4; col 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a computer (fig. 11 indicator 4), an imaging device configured to capture said image data (fig. 11 indicator 1), and an ancillary data module for transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device for manipulating said image data (fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), said ancillary data module performing on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, to manipulate said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, to select said one or more ancillary data files that are stored on the data source, and to download said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device, said one or more on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional electronic communication path currently exists from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 37-56; col. 7 lines 15-50; col. 9 lines 9-13), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 40.) Although Sarbadhikari teaches

Art Unit: 2622

the data source being implemented as a computer, with the same functionality that is provide by the removable memory card embodiment applied therein (col. 11 lines 26-37), a data source being implemented as *a computer in a distributed computer network* is not taught (emphasis added.)

5           Nevertheless, Steinberg teaches a similar system for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed (fig. 1 indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer  
10 of the system for manipulating image data as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create a system for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files from more than one computer.

15           Regarding claim 4, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 4 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device includes at least one of a digital still camera device ('264 - col. 5 lines 55-57), a video camera device, and an electronic scanner device.

20           Regarding claim 5, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 5 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are transferred from said data source to said imaging

Art Unit: 2622

device ('264 - col. 2 line 50 - col. 3 line 2) by utilizing a wireless transmission process ('325 - col. 4 lines 61-65.)

Regarding claim 6, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 6 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module manipulates said image data by combining selected ones of said ancillary data files with said image data to generate new composite data ('264 - col. 10 line 33-39.)

Regarding claim 7, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 7 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device includes a capture subsystem ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 10) and a control module ('264 - fig. 10 indicators A and B), said control module having a central processing unit ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 20), a memory ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 32, indicator 31), a viewfinder ('264 - fig. 10 indicator 29), and one or more input/output interfaces ('264 - fig. 10 indicators 21 and 26.)

Regarding claim 8, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 8 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said memory includes an application software program ('264 - col. 10 lines 1-4), an operating system ('264 - col. 7 lines 51-52), said ancillary data module (driving indicators 20, 18, and 22 of fig. 10), said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 8 lines 52-58, col. 10 lines 5-6), a display manager ('264 - col. 9 lines 6-11 and col. 7 lines 44-49), data storage for storing said image data ('264 - fig. 4, fig. 10 indicators 18 and 35, col. 9 lines

15-26), and one or more camera menus for display upon said viewfinder ('264 - col. 7 lines 44-49, col. 9 lines 6-11.)

Regarding claim 9, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 9 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 7 supra), including teaching a system wherein said  
5 one or more input/output interfaces include a distributed electronic network interface ('325 fig. 1 indicator 16), a host computer interface ('264 - fig. 11 indicator 34; '325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a printer interface ('325 col. 4 lines 2-4), a wireless communications interface ('325 col. 4 lines 61-65), a user interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 21), and a removable storage media interface ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 26; '325 fig. 2 indicator 58.)

10 It is also noted by the Examiner that this claim, as currently written, only requires a minimum of one input/output interface, by way of the limiting language of "one or more input/output interfaces".

Regarding claim 10, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 10 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said  
15 ancillary data module includes a download manager for transferring said ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device and analyzing said ancillary data files ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-67), an editing module for combining said one or more ancillary data files with said image data ('264 - col. 9 lines 13-21), a data manager for controlling and reorganizing said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 4 lines 63-64, col. 5  
20 lines 22-25, col. 7 lines 60-65, and col. 9 lines 13-50) and miscellaneous routines that include a conversion routine for translating said one or more ancillary data files into a compatible format ('325 - figs. 3 and 9, col. 7 lines 10-13.)



Regarding claim 11, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 11 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files each include a data portion and a corresponding descriptor tag that is analyzed by said ancillary data module to identify, characterize, and categorize a corresponding one of said one or more ancillary data files ('264 - col. 4 lines 58-63, col. 7 lines 31-44, in which information other than the included data is inherently necessary for identification of the enhancement.)

Regarding claim 13, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 13 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said data source is configured to facilitate interactively accessing, manipulating, and downloading said one or more ancillary data files to said imaging device by a system user ('264 - col. 7 lines 38-50.)

Regarding claim 14, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 14 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device establishes an active bi-directional electronic communication path to said data source ('264 - col. 4 lines 44-47), said active bi-directional electronic communication path being established by both an automatic connection protocol ('264 - col. 7 lines 30-65, in which detection of the presence of a card and the presence of a connection to a computer are read to be comparable) and also by a user-initiated connection protocol ('264 - col. 4 lines 46-47; fig. 11 via connection of indicator 38.)

Regarding claim 15, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 15 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 14 supra), including teaching a system wherein

said ancillary data module performs one or more on-line management procedures while said active bi-directional electronic communication path is available, said one or more on-line management procedures including a data source content review ('264 - col. 7 lines 32-40, 54-57) and an ancillary-data file download procedure ('264 - col. 7 lines 60-  
5 65.)

It is also noted by the Examiner that this claim, as currently written, only requires a minimum of one on-line management procedure, by way of the limiting language of "one or more on-line management procedures".

Regarding claim 16, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim  
10 16 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module downloads a special instruction file that corresponds to a selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file including information that instructs said imaging device how to correctly utilize said selected ancillary data file, said special instruction file being formatted as an embedded instruction file that is  
15 embedded in said selected ancillary data file ('264 - col. 10 lines 43-50) and also as a discrete instruction file that is not embedded in said selected ancillary data file ('264 - col. 9 line 51 – col. 10 line 18; col. 10 lines 43-50.)

Regarding claim 17, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim  
17 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 15 supra), including teaching a system wherein  
20 said imaging device terminates said active bi-directional electronic communication path to said data source when said on-line management procedures have been completed, said active bi-directional electronic communication path being terminated by both a

user-initiated termination protocol ('264 - fig. 3, col. 9 lines 3-14, in which an analogous process would apply to a tethered data source instead of an inserted card; '325 – col. 5 lines 15-17) and an active bi-directional electronic communication path being terminated by an automatic termination protocol ('325 – col. 5 lines 19-23.)

5           It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for both user-initiated termination protocol, in which actions of a user control the camera use, as well as automatic termination in order to allow a system user the flexibility to both control functionality, as well as have various processes operate seamlessly in the background without the need for user interaction.

10           Regarding claims 21, 24-31, and 33-37, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 1, 4-11, and 13-17, respectively, as discussed above.

**Claims 2 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
15   over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), with a supporting reference Creamer et al. (US 6,930,709.)

Regarding claim 2, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 2 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), except for explicitly teaching a system wherein said data source includes an image station site on an Internet network.

20           The Examiner cites as supporting reference, Creamer et al. (US 6,930,709- filed on December 3, 1998), to illustrate the related equivalency of a computer in a distributed computer network being employed as "an image station site on an Internet

network", a concept and equivalency that is well known and expected in the art.

Creamer details a general purpose personal computer, incorporated in concert with the World Wide Web, that has the ability to place an image on the Internet, as well as states that the computer is usually dedicated to serving the camera (col. 1 lines 16-65.)

5 Therefore, this reference is presented to support what is well known with respect to a computer dedicated and used for image data and connected to the Internet, being equivalent in naming convention to an image station site on an Internet network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the computer in a distributed computer network to be an image station on an Internet  
10 network for the purposes of having a dedicated general purpose computer employed for image/camera related tasks such as manipulating image data, and which can be accessed via remote locations connected throughout the world wide web or an equivalent distributed network for the purpose of manipulating image data. (It is also noted that Applicants define the Internet as a distributed network (see Abstract), and  
15 that claim 2 serves to further limits the data source of claim 1, which is explicitly implemented as a computer in a distributed computer network.)

Regarding claim 22, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 2 as discussed above.

20 **Claims 3, 23, and 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) and Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in view of Qian (US 6,950,130) and in further view of Aihara et al. (US 6,223,190.)

Regarding claim 3, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 3 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), except for teaching a system wherein said ancillary data files include an image background file and an Internet webpage file. However, Sarbadhikari does teach merging ancillary data files with those captured by the camera ('264 – col. 5 lines 22-27), such as image template files ('264 - figs. 8 and 9, col. 6 lines 56-59) and overlay files ('264 - col. 5 line 25-27), for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations ('264 - col. 10 lines 24-30.)

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files as taught by Qian with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Furthermore, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files as taught by Aihara, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Regarding claim 23, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 3 as discussed above.

Regarding claim 46, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 11/31 supra), including wherein said ancillary data module analyzes said descriptor tag corresponding to a downloaded one of said ancillary data files, said ancillary data module responsively assigning said downloaded one of said ancillary data files to one of several file categories in said imaging device ('264 - col. 7 lines 31-44), said file categories including a template category ('264 col. 10 line 24 – col. 11 line 13), an overlay category ('264 - col. 7 line 43), and an instructions category ('264 - col. 9 line 51 – col. 10 line 18; col. 10 lines 43-50.) However, neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to disclose a background category or an Internet web page category.

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) Based on these, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files, and an associated category for them within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device, all of which being found within an organized (categorized) format to facilitate their use.

Further, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files, and an associated category for them within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates, overlays, and backgrounds, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device, all of which being found within an organized (categorized) format to facilitate their use.

**Claims 12 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) and Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in view of Aihara et al. (US 6,223,190.)

Regarding claim 12, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 12 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 1 supra), including teaching a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer utilizing ancillary-data production equipment ('264 - col. 6 lines 58-63.) However, neither Sarbadhikari nor Steinberg is found to teach a system wherein said one or more ancillary data files are also created by a system user on a local computer device.

Nevertheless, Aihara teaches that a user can create the ancillary data file (col. 7 lines 33-38.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a user to create the ancillary data file, in conjunction with the

system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg in which ancillary data files are created by a system manufacturer, so that a user may not only have the ability to employ the ancillary data files provided by a manufacturer, but also to create their own ancillary data files in order to give the result its distinctive appearance ('190 – col. 7 lines 36-38.)

- 5 It is further noted that the specification at lines 1-8 of page 15, provides for the creation of ancillary data files by the system user in one embodiment, and alternatively, by a manufacturer in another.

Regarding claim 32, although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claim 12 as discussed above.

10

**Claims 18-20, 38-40, and 41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Anderson (US 6,177,957.)

- Regarding claim 18, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 15 18 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 17 supra), except for teaching a system wherein said ancillary data module performs an off-line management procedure for said one or more ancillary data files that have been downloaded from said data source, said off-line management procedure including a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module categorizes said one or more ancillary data files, said imaging 20 device responsively updating camera menus to include said one or more ancillary data files to thereby enable a system user to utilize said one or more ancillary data files. It is noted that Sarbadhikari does teach on-line management of ancillary data files, in that



the identified files may be selectable chosen by the user when connected to the data source (col. 4 lines 40-47; col. 7 lines 38-47.)

Nevertheless, Anderson is found to teach dynamically updating software driven features in an electronic imaging device, in which the user may supplement the baseline application programming of the imaging device (col. 2 lines 18-25.) The system of Anderson provides a procedure for updating of camera menus to reflect the addition of one or more ancillary data files, thereby enabling a system user to utilize one or more of the ancillary data files, (col. 8 line - col. 9 line 19.) The procedure of Anderson further teaches a file descriptor identification procedure by which said ancillary data module categorizes said one or more ancillary data files (figs. 7 and 8; col. 8 line 1 – col. 9 line 19.) Although Anderson employs hot mounted files, Anderson demonstrates a teaching of a menu reorganization procedure for files made accessible to the imaging device. When taken in light of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which includes ancillary data files selected and downloaded to the imaging device from a computer in a distributed computer network, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to add the functionality of a user accessible menu which was appropriately updated to reflect the newly added software enhancements available, so that the user may fully utilize all the imaging device's available functionality. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ a file descriptor identification procedure similar to that taught by Anderson, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to correctly identify and implement the ancillary data files, and their corresponding

Art Unit: 2622

functionality, which have been added to increase the available functionality of the imaging device, based on the selected files previously added via download from a computer in a distributed computer network. As to the occurrence of the procedure taught above, in conjunction with a teaching by Anderson of the procedure occurring within the imaging device (fig. 8), it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the procedure of the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson be performed off-line, so that once the selected files had been downloaded, the imaging device is free to operate as a physically autonomous device, having no further need to be tethered or on-line with the computer, and free to perform the procedure at locations other than those accessible to the computer and at times when on-line accessibility is limited or no longer available.

Regarding claim 19, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 19 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said off-line management procedure includes a file reorganization procedure ('957 – col. 9 lines 1-6) and a file deletion procedure ('957 – col. 9 line 55 – col. 10 line18).

Regarding claim 20, Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Anderson teach all the limitations of claim 20 (see the 103(a) rejection to claim 18 supra), including teaching a system wherein said imaging device utilizes an editing module ('264 - fig. 2 indicator 22) from said ancillary data module to effectively combine selected ones of said one or more ancillary data files with one or more images from said image data to thereby create a new composite image ('264 - col. 5 lines 22-24, col. 10 lines 30-36.)

Regarding claims 38-40 although the wording is different, the material is considered substantively equivalent to claims 18-20, respectively, as discussed above.

Regarding claim 41, Sarbadhikari teaches storing one or more ancillary data files in a data source (col. 11 lines 26-37), said data source being implemented as a  
5 computer (fig. 11 indicator 4; col. 11 lines 26-37), capturing said image data with an imaging device (col. 2 line 66 – col. 3 line 2; col. 5 line 55 – col. 6 line 26; col. 11 lines 26-37), transferring said one or more ancillary data files from said data source to said imaging device by using an ancillary data module (col. 4 lines 44-47; fig. 10 indicators 20, 18, and 22; col. 6 lines 10-37; col. 11 lines 26-37), and manipulating said image  
10 data with said one or more ancillary data files (col. 6 lines 5-58; col. 10 lines 24-39), said ancillary data files performing one or more on-line management procedures during which a system user interactively utilizes said imaging device to view, manipulate select and download said ancillary data files, said one or more on-line management procedures occurring while an active bi-directional communication path currently exists  
15 from said imaging device to said computer (col. 4 lines 37-56; col. 7 lines 15-50; col. 9 lines 9-13; col. 11 lines 26-37), said one or more ancillary data files including one or more image data files that said imaging device combines with said image data to create a new composite image (col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 40.) However, Sarbadhikari does not teach any of the above steps occurring in conjunction with a computer in a distributed  
20 computer network. Additionally, although Sarbadhikari does teach the above program/programming/processor related steps, Sarbadhikari does not teach each step involving program instructions within a computer-readable medium.

Nevertheless, Steinberg is found to teach similar steps for manipulating image data in which a computer in a computer in a distributed computer network is employed (fig. 1 indicators 16 and 18; col. 4 lines 2-4 and lines 49-53.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

5 incorporated a computer in a distributed computer network as taught by Steinberg, with the computer as taught by Sarbadhikari, in order to create the steps for manipulating image data which allowed for transferal of one or more ancillary data files from a computer far removed from that of the imaging device configured to capture said image data, as well as to possibly allow for the transferal of one or more ancillary data files  
10 from more than one computer or data source.

Furthermore, Anderson is found to teach a computer readable medium comprising program instructions for a system that dynamically updates software functions in an electronic imaging device (col. 13 lines 33-54; col. 14 lines 25-43.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to  
15 transfer the steps as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, which are effectuated by processors within programmed devices, and due to their processor based execution, are employed as programmed instructions, onto a computer readable medium comprising program instructions as taught by Anderson, so that they may be easily transferred or from one computer in a distributed computer network to another computer  
20 in another distributed computer network, or so that they may be loaded as firmware onto a device to update or restore camera functionality without having to update or replace device hardware.

**Claim 43** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Harada (US 6,195,511.)

Regarding claim 43, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 5 43 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), except wherein a data manager from said ancillary data module deletes a local ancillary data file in said imaging device after detecting a file type of a newly-downloaded one of said ancillary data files.

Nevertheless, Harada is found to teach the rewriting of camera programming upon detecting that a newer version has been downloaded (col. 6 line 28 – col. 7 line 7; 10 in which the rewriting of a file is determined by the examiner to be equivalent to a deletion because the original file is ultimately replaced by a newer version of the file.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to delete a local file after detecting a newer file as taught by Harada with the method as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, in order to provide a method updating camera 15 programming while maintaining minimum/lower memory requirements.

**Claim 44** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further view of Qian (US 6,950,130), in view of Berstis (US 6,721,001), in view of Silverbrook et 20 al. (US 6,894,694.)

Regarding claim 44, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 1/21 supra), including wherein said ancillary data

files include a text overlay file for superimposing upon said image data ('264 – col. 5 lines 22-27), special program instructions that directly enable or instruct said image device how to utilize said ancillary data files ('264 – col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 25), and template files that that are utilized as settings or frameworks for combining with said image data ('264 col. 10 line 24 – col. 11 line 13), said template files including an image transition file ('264 – col. 10 lines 46-50) and a still template file ('264 – figs. 8 and 9, col. 10 lines 26-30.) However, although Sarbadhikari and Steinberg provide for the inclusion of other files capable of affecting the captured image data ('264 – col. 4 lines 61-63), neither expressly provide for a background file of visual background data for combining with said image data, or template files including an animated template file and a voice-annotated template file.

Qian teaches the both the creation of background files and the replacement of backgrounds in captured images (Abstract; col. 1 lines 43-53; claim 1.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include background files as taught by Qian with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari and Steinberg, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file merging option, in addition to templates and overlays, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

Berstis is found to disclose voice annotation programming (fig. 3 indicator 304, col. 4 lines 5-8.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for a voice-annotation as taught by Berstis as

another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, and backgrounds, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.

Silverbrook is found to disclose animation programming (col. 4 line 64 – col. 5 line 6.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include programming for animation as taught by Silverbrook as another data file within the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, Qian, and Berstis so that the user is provided with another ancillary data file option, in addition to templates, overlays, backgrounds, and voice-annotations, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to further expand the overall potential functionality of the imaging device.

Further, Aihara teaches Internet webpage files employed as ancillary data files (col. 9 lines 40-42, col. 10 line 17 – col. 12 line 36.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the ancillary data files as taught by Aihara, with the system as taught by Sarbadhikari, Steinberg, and Qian, for the purpose of enhancing the images captured by the user for particular situations, as well as to expand the potential functionality of the imaging device.

**Claim 45** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarbadhikari et al. (US 5,477,264) in view of Steinberg et al. (US 6,628,325), in further

Art Unit: 2622

view of Park et al. (US 6,731,305), Kondoh et al. (US 6,968,058), and Satoh et al. (US 5,717,496.)

Regarding claim 45, Sarbadhikari and Steinberg teach all the limitations of claim 44 (see the 103(a) rejection to claims 11/31 supra), except for expressly disclosing wherein said descriptor tag includes a data format, a data type, a data structure, and a data size.

Nevertheless, it is well known to those skilled in the art to include descriptor information associated with data information, as disclosed by Park (data structure and size, col. 4 lines 22-24), Kondoh (data format, col. 4 lines 60-64), and Satoh (data type, fig. 50, col. 26 lines 57-66.) Based on these teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow for a wide breadth of information to be includable with a descriptor tag so expand embedded run information and other related pre-processed information.

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Parulski et al. (US 5,633,678) discloses a similar method of data transfer.



**Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary C. Vieaux whose telephone number is 571-272-7318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:00pm.


5 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, NgocYen T. Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for  
10 published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a  
15 USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gary C. Vieaux  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

Gcv2

20

  
NGOC-YEN VU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER